

Remarks

An Amendment was filed October 8, 2003 with Applicant's Request for Continued Examination. On October 27, 2003 the PTO issued a "Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment," requesting a new Listing of Claims section which included a listing of the cancelled claims. The cancelled claims were then included in a corrected amendment filed December 18, 2003. On February 4, 2004, the PTO issued a second "Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment" on the grounds that the Claim 83 status identifier is incorrect. Applicant phoned Legal Instruments Examiner Felicia Alan and was advised that the indicator "PREVIOUSLY AMENDED" should be changed to "PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED." Accordingly, the requested claim indicator for Claim 83 is now included on the listing of claims beginning at Page 2 of this response.

If any additional issues should arise concerning the compliance of Applicant's amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the Legal Instruments Examiner phone the undersigned attorney so that any such remaining issues may be resolved by telephone.

For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant is repeating the Remarks provided in the October 8, 2003 amendment as follows.

Claims 80, 88, 89, 90, and 98 are amended. Claims 80 and 82-121 are pending.

Applicant confirms the election of the species of etch residue removal chemistry recited Claim 112, but has not cancelled Claim 113 as further examination of Claim 113 will be requested once a generic claim is allowed.

In response to the rejection of Claim 112 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification as originally filed supports the language of the claim. In particular, the specification describes that the rinse solution disclosed in the application is suitable for rinsing substrates following their treatment with etch residue removal chemistries or chemical strippers. N-methylpyrrolidinone is listed in the specification as an example of one such stripper. The rinse solution recited in the claims (e.g. comprising mono- or polycarboxylic acid) is recited for rinsing the etch residue removal chemistry from the wafer and for minimizing corrosion. Applicants respectfully submit that the specification fully supports the claim language, and requests that the rejection of Claim 112 be withdrawn.

The claims stand rejected as being anticipated or made obvious by Hineman (U.S. 6,313,048), Eisenmann (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin v. 18, No. 8, p 2590) and EP '336.

The claims as amended clarify that the anti-corrosive aqueous medium recited in the claims is used for rinsing the etch residue removal chemistry from the substrate and minimizing metal corrosion on the substrate. The solution of phosphoric acid and acetic acid described by Hineman is a cleaning solution consisting of phosphoric acid and acetic acid that is used to remove residues such as post-ash residues, thus exposing the substrates to this solution does not perform the step of "rinsing the etch residue removal chemistry from the substrate," since the Hineman cleaning solution is itself the residue removal chemistry. For this reason, the claims are patentable over Hineman.

There is likewise no teaching in Eisenmann of the use of the claimed rinse solution for rinsing etch residue removal chemistry from the substrate and minimizing metal corrosion on the substrate. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the reference does not state that the substrate has an etch residue removal chemistry thereon, and Applicant further submits that there is no suggestion that the rinse described in Eisenmann carries out the step of rinsing such chemistry from the wafers while also minimizing metal corrosion.

In view of the foregoing, early reconsideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: February 10, 2004

By: Kathleen A. Frost
Kathleen A. Frost
Reg. No. 37,326

Attorneys for Applicant(s)